arXiv:1401.3008v2 [math.CO] 29 Aug 2014

A Comparison between the Zero Forcing Number and the Strong Metric Dimension of Graphs

Cong X. Kang[1] and **Eunjeong Yi**[2]
Texas A&M University at Galveston, Galveston, TX 77553, USA
kangc@tamug.edu[1]; *yie@tamug.edu*[2]

Abstract

The *zero forcing number*, $Z(G)$, of a graph G is the minimum cardinality of a set S of black vertices (whereas vertices in $V(G) - S$ are colored white) such that $V(G)$ is turned black after finitely many applications of "the color-change rule": a white vertex is converted black if it is the only white neighbor of a black vertex. The *strong metric dimension*, $sdim(G)$, of a graph G is the minimum among cardinalities of all strong resolving sets: $W \subseteq V(G)$ is a *strong resolving set* of G if for any $u, v \in V(G)$, there exists an $x \in W$ such that either u lies on an $x-v$ geodesic or v lies on an $x-u$ geodesic. In this paper, we prove that $Z(G) \leq sdim(G) + 3r(G)$ for a connected graph G, where $r(G)$ is the cycle rank of G. Further, we prove the sharp bound $Z(G) \leq sdim(G)$ when G is a tree or a unicyclic graph, and we characterize trees T attaining $Z(T) = sdim(T)$. It is easy to see that $sdim(T + e) - sdim(T)$ can be arbitrarily large for a tree T; we prove that $sdim(T + e) \geq sdim(T) - 2$ and show that the bound is sharp.

Keywords: zero forcing number, strong metric dimension, cycle rank, tree, unicyclic graph
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C12, 05C50, 05C05, 05C38

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a finite, simple, undirected, and connected graph of order $|V(G)| \geq 2$. The *path cover number*, $P(G)$, of G is the minimum number of vertex disjoint paths, occurring as induced subgraphs of G, that cover all the vertices of G. The *degree* $\deg_G(v)$ of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is the number of edges incident to the vertex v in G; a *leaf* (or *pendant*) is a vertex of degree one. We denote the number of leaves of G by $\sigma(G)$. For $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $\langle S \rangle$ the subgraph induced by S. The *distance* between two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, denoted by $d_G(u, v)$, is the length of a shortest path in G between u and v. We omit G when ambiguity is not a concern.

The notion of a zero forcing set, as well as the associated zero forcing number, of a simple graph was introduced by the aforementioned "AIM group" in [1] to bound the minimum rank of graphs. Let each vertex of a graph G be given one of two colors, dubbed "black" and "white" by convention. Let S denote the (initial) set of black vertices of G. The *color-change rule* converts the color of a vertex from white to black if the white vertex u_2 is the only white neighbor of a black vertex u_1; we say "u_1 forces u_2" in this case. The set S is said to be *a zero forcing set* of G if all vertices of G will be turned black after finitely many applications of the color-change rule. The *zero forcing number*, $Z(G)$, of G is the minimum of $|S|$, as S varies over all zero forcing sets of G.

Since its introduction by the "AIM group", zero forcing number has become a graph parameter studied for its own sake, as an interesting invariant of a graph. For example, for discussions on the

number of steps it takes for a zero forcing set to turn the entire graph black (the graph parameter has been named the *iteration index* or the *propagation time* of a graph), see [6] and [12]. In [13], a probabilistic interpretation of zero forcing in graphs is introduced. It's also noteworthy that physicists have independently studied the zero forcing parameter, referring to it as the *graph infection number*, in conjunction with the control of quantum systems (see [3], [4], and [19]).

A vertex $x \in V(G)$ *resolves* a pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ if $d(u,x) \neq d(v,x)$. A vertex $x \in V(G)$ *strongly resolves* a pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ if u lies on an $x-v$ geodesic or v lies on an $x-u$ geodesic. A set of vertices $W \subseteq V(G)$ *(strongly) resolves* G if every pair of distinct vertices of G is (strongly) resolved by some vertex in W; then W is called a *(strong) resolving set* of G. For an ordered set $W = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\} \subseteq V(G)$ of distinct vertices, the *metric representation* of $v \in V(G)$ with respect to W is the k-vector $D_G(v|W) = (d(v,w_1), d(v,w_2), \ldots, d(v,w_k))$. The *metric dimension* of G, denoted by $dim(G)$, is the minimum among cardinalities of all resolving sets of G. The *strong metric dimension* of G, denoted by $sdim(G)$, is the minimum among cardinalities of all *strong* resolving sets of G.

Metric dimension was introduced by Slater [20] and, independently, by Harary and Melter [11]. Applications of metric dimension can be found in robot navigation [15], sonar [20], combinatorial optimization [18], and pharmaceutical chemistry [5]. Strong metric dimension was introduced by Sebö and Tannier [18]; they observed that if W is a strong resolving set, then the vectors $\{D_G(v|W) \mid v \in V(G)\}$ uniquely determine the graph G (also see [14] for more detail); whereas for a resolving set U of G, the vectors $\{D_G(v|U) \mid v \in V(G)\}$ may not uniquely determine G. It is noted that determining the (strong) metric dimension of a graph is an NP-hard problem (see [10] and [16]).

In this paper, we initiate a comparative study between the zero forcing number and the strong metric dimension of graphs. The zero forcing number and the strong metric dimension coincide for paths P_n, complete graphs K_n, complete bi-partite graphs $K_{s,t}$ $(s+t \geq 3)$, for examples; they are 1, $n-1$, and $s+t-2$, respectively. The Cartesian product of two paths shows that zero forcing number can be arbitrarily larger than strong metric dimension; cycles C_n show that strong metric dimension can be arbitrarily larger than zero forcing number. We prove the sharp bound that $Z(G) \leq sdim(G)$ when G is a tree or a unicyclic graph, and we characterize trees T attaining $Z(T) = sdim(T)$. It is easy to see that $sdim(T+e) - sdim(T)$ can be arbitrarily large for a tree T; we prove that $sdim(T+e) \geq sdim(T) - 2$ and show that the bound is sharp. In the final section, we show, for any graph G with cycle rank $r(G)$, that $Z(G) \leq sdim(G) + 3r(G)$ and pose an open problem pertaining to its refinement.

2 The zero forcing number and the strong metric dimension of trees

In this section, we show that $Z(T) \leq sdim(T)$ for a tree T, and we characterize trees T satisfying $Z(T) = sdim(T)$. We first recall some results that will be used here.

Theorem 2.1. *Let T be a tree. Then*

(a) [1] $Z(T) = P(T)$,

(b) [18] $sdim(T) = \sigma(T) - 1$.

Theorem 2.2. *[17] Let G be a graph with cut-vertex $v \in V(G)$. Let $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k$ be the vertex sets for the connected components of $\langle V(G) - \{v\}\rangle$, and for $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $G_i = \langle V_i \cup \{v\}\rangle$. Then $Z(G) \geq [\sum_{i=1}^{k} Z(G_i)] - k + 1$.*

The following terminology are defined for a graph G. A vertex of degree at least three is called a *major vertex*. A leaf u is called *a terminal vertex of a major vertex v* if $d(u,v) < d(u,w)$ for every

other major vertex w. The *terminal degree*, $ter(v)$, of a major vertex v is the number of terminal vertices of v. A major vertex v is an *exterior major vertex* if it has positive terminal degree. An *exterior degree two vertex* is a vertex of degree 2 that lies on a shortest path from a terminal vertex to its major vertex, and an *interior degree two vertex* z is a vertex of degree 2 such that a shortest path from z to any terminal vertex includes a major vertex.

Theorem 2.3. *[8] Let T be a tree. Then*

(a) $dim(T) \leq Z(T)$,

(b) $dim(T) = Z(T)$ if and only if T has no interior degree two vertex and each major vertex v of T satisfies $ter(v) \geq 2$.

It is shown in [9] that $P(T) \leq \sigma(T) - 1$; this and Theorem 2.1 imply the following

Theorem 2.4. *For any tree T, $Z(T) \leq sdim(T)$.*

Next, we characterize trees T satisfying $Z(T) = sdim(T)$.

Theorem 2.5. *For any tree T, we have $Z(T) = sdim(T)$ if and only if T has an interior degree two vertex on every $v_i - v_j$ path, where v_i and v_j are major vertices of T.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) Suppose that there exist a pair of major vertices, say v_1 and v_2, in T such that no interior degree two vertex lies in the $v_1 - v_2$ path. We may assume $v_1v_2 \in E(T)$. If not, replace v_2 with the vertex adjacent to v_1 on the $v_1 - v_2$ path. We consider two disjoint subtrees $T_1, T_2 \subset T$ such that $v_1 \in V(T_1)$, $v_2 \in V(T_2)$, $V(T) = V(T_1) \cup V(T_2)$ and $E(T) = E(T_1) \cup E(T_2) \cup \{v_1v_2\}$. By Theorem 2.4, $P(T_1) \leq \sigma(T_1) - 1$ and $P(T_2) \leq \sigma(T_2) - 1$. So, $P(T) \leq P(T_1) + P(T_2) \leq \sigma(T_1) + \sigma(T_2) - 2 = \sigma(T) - 2$, i.e., $Z(T) \leq sdim(T) - 1$.

($\Longleftarrow$) We will induct on $m(T)$, the number of major vertices of the tree T. If $m(T) = 0$, then $Z(T) = 1 = sdim(T)$; if $m(T) = 1$, then $Z(T) = P(T) = \sigma(T) - 1 = sdim(T)$. Suppose the statement holds for all trees T with $2 \leq m(T) \leq k$. Let x be a degree 2 vertex lying between two major vertices u and v of a tree T with $m(T) = k + 1$. Let ℓ and r be the two edges of T incident with x, and denote by T_ℓ (T_r, resp.) the subtree of $T - r$ ($T - \ell$, resp.) containing x. Clearly, T is the vertex sum of T_ℓ and T_r at the vertices being labeled x. The induction hypothesis applies to T_ℓ and T_r, since each has at most k major vertices; thus, $Z(T_\ell) = \sigma(T_\ell) - 1$ and $Z(T_r) = \sigma(T_r) - 1$. Now by Theorem 2.2, $Z(T) \geq (Z(T_\ell) + Z(T_r)) - 1 = (\sigma(T_\ell) - 1 + \sigma(T_r) - 1) - 1 = \sigma(T) - 1 = sdim(T)$; thus, by Theorem 2.4, $Z(T) = sdim(T)$. □

Remark 2.6. *Notice $dim(T) \leq Z(T) \leq sdim(T)$ by Theorem 2.3(a) and Theorem 2.4, where the equalities are characterized by Theorem 2.3(b) and Theorem 2.5.*

3 The zero forcing number and the strong metric dimension of unicyclic graphs

A graph is *unicyclic* if it contains exactly one cycle. Notice that a connected graph G is unicyclic if and only if $|E(G)| = |V(G)|$. By $T + e$, we shall mean a unicyclic graph obtained from a tree T by attaching the edge e joining two non-adjacent vertices of T. In this section, we show that $Z(G) \leq sdim(G)$ for a unicyclic graph G and the bound is sharp. We first recall some results that will be used here.

We say that $x \in V(G)$ is *maximally distant* from $y \in V(G)$ if $d_G(x, y) \geq d_G(z, y)$, for every $z \in N_G(x) = \{v \in V(G) \mid xv \in E(G)\}$. If x is maximally distant from y and y is maximally distant from x, then we say that x and y are *mutually maximally distant* and denote this by x MMD y. It is pointed out in [16] that if x MMD y in G, then any strong resolving set of G must contain either x or y. Noting that any two distinct leaves of a graph G are MMD, we have the following

Observation 3.1. *For any connected graph G, all but one of the $\sigma(G)$ leaves must belong to any strong resolving set of G.*

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 2$. Then*

(a) [7] $Z(G) - 1 \leq Z(G + e) \leq Z(G) + 1$ for $e \in E(\overline{G})$, where $\overline{G}$ denotes the complement of G,

(b) [21] $sdim(G) = 1$ if and only if $G = P_n$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let T be a tree of order at least three. Then $sdim(T + e) \geq sdim(T) - 2$ for $e \in E(\overline{T})$, and the bound is sharp.*

Proof. Since $\sigma(T) - 2 \leq \sigma(T + e) \leq \sigma(T)$, the desired inequality follows from Theorem 2.1(b) and Observation 3.1. For the sharpness of the bound, let T be the "comb" with $k \geq 4$ exterior major vertices (see Figure 1). Then $sdim(T) = \sigma(T) - 1 = k + 1$. Since $\{\ell_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq k - 1\}$ forms a strong resolving set for $T + e$, $sdim(T + e) \leq k - 1 = sdim(T) - 2$; thus $sdim(T + e) = sdim(T) - 2$. □



Figure 1: Unicyclic graph $T + e$ satisfying $sdim(T + e) = sdim(T) - 2$

Remark 3.4. *We note that $sdim(T + e) - sdim(T)$ can be arbitrarily large. For example, suppose that $T = P_n$ and $T + e = C_n$; then $sdim(T) = 1$ and, as noted in [16], $sdim(C_n) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.*

Theorem 2.4, Theorem 3.2(a), and Proposition 3.3 imply that $Z(T + e) \leq sdim(T + e) + 3$. We will show that, in fact, $Z(T + e) \leq sdim(T + e)$.

As defined in [2], a *partial n-sun* is the graph H_n obtained from C_n by appending a leaf to each vertex in some $U \subseteq V(C_n)$, and a *segment* of H_n refers to any maximal subset of consecutive vertices in U. By a *generalized partial n-sun*, we shall mean a graph obtained from C_n by attaching a finite, and not necessarily equal, number of leaves to each vertex $v \in V(C_n)$. See Figure 2.



(a) a partial 6-sun (b) a generalized partial 6-sun

Figure 2: A partial 6-sun and a generalized partial 6-sun

Theorem 3.5. *[17] Let H_n be a partial n-sun with segments $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_t$. Then*

$$Z(H_n) = \max\left\{2, \sum_{i=1}^{t} \left\lceil \frac{|U_i|}{2} \right\rceil \right\}.$$

Corollary 3.6. *Let H_n be a partial n-sun. Then $Z(H_n) \leq sdim(H_n)$.*

Proof. The formula in Theorem 3.5 implies that $Z(H_n) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. Considering MMD vertices, it's clear that $sdim(H_n) \geq sdim(C_n)$ and, as noted in [16], $sdim(C_n) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. □

Following [2], for a given unicyclic graph G, a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is called an *appropriate vertex* if at least two components of $G-v$ are paths; a vertex $\ell \in V(G)$ is called a *peripheral leaf* if $\deg_G(\ell) = 1$, $\ell u \in E(G)$, and $\deg_G(u) = 2$ (whereas $\deg_G(u) \leq 2$ in [2]). The *trimmed form* of G is an induced subgraph obtained by a sequence of deletions of appropriate vertices, isolated paths, and peripheral leaves until no more such deletions are possible. Further, define $sdim(G) = sdim(G_1) + sdim(G_2)$ (*additivity of sdim over disjoint components*), when G is the disjoint union of G_1 and G_2. This is a natural extension of the (original) definition of *sdim* for a connected graph; it is needed for the inductive arguments to come.

Remark 3.7. *[17] Let G be a unicyclic graph. Then*

(a) for an appropriate vertex v in G, $Z(G-v) - 1 = Z(G)$;

(b) for an isolated path P in G, $Z(G - V(P)) + 1 = Z(G)$;

(c) for a peripheral leaf ℓ in G, $Z(G-\ell) = Z(G)$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let G be a unicyclic graph, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the unique cycle in G.*

(a) If v is an appropriate vertex in G such that $v \notin V(\mathcal{C})$, then $sdim(G-v) - 1 \leq sdim(G)$.

(b) If P is an isolated path in G, then $sdim(G - V(P)) + 1 = sdim(G)$.

(c) If ℓ is a peripheral leaf in G, then $sdim(G-\ell) = sdim(G)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}_H(x) = \{y \in V(H) : y \text{ MMD } x\}$.

(a) Denote the connected components of $G-v$ by G_1 (with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq G_1$) and $T_1, \ldots T_k$ ($k \geq 2$), of which T_1 and T_2 (and possibly more trees) are isolated paths; let u denote the sole neighbor of v in $V(G_1)$. Let S be a minimum strong resolving set of G. Let L denote the set of leaves in $G - G_1$. By Observation 3.1, $0 \leq |L - S| \leq 1$. If $|L-S| = 0$, then $S \cup \{u\}$ forms a strong resolving set for $G-v$, since a geodesic between any $\ell \in L$ and any $x \in V(G_1)$ necessarily passes through u; thus we have $sdim(G-v) - 1 \leq sdim(G)$. So, suppose $|L-S| = 1$. Since L strongly resolves the complement of G_1 in $G-v$, it suffices to prove the following

Claim. $S \cap V(G_1)$ strongly resolves G_1.

Proof of Claim. Let $\ell_0 \in L - S$. Let $x, y \in V(G_1)$ be strongly resolved by $\ell \in L \cap S$; we will show that x and y are strongly resolved by some $z \in S \cap V(G_1)$. If x or y, say x, does not lie on $\mathcal{C}$, then there must exist a leaf $\ell' \in V(G_1) \cap S$ which strongly resolves x and y, and we are done. So, suppose both x and y lie on $\mathcal{C}$. Let u' denote the vertex on $\mathcal{C}$ which is closest to u. There must exist a $w \in V(G_1)$ satisfying w MMD ℓ_0 and such that $d(u', w')$ equals the diameter of $\mathcal{C}$; here w' denotes the vertex on $\mathcal{C}$ which is closest to w. This w lies in S, since $\ell_0 \notin S$. Notice that x and y together lie on the same one of the two semi-circles defined by u' and w'; otherwise, $u' - x$ geodesic does not contain y and $u' - y$ geodesic does not contain x; the relevance here being that a geodesic from $\ell \in L$ to either x or y must pass through u'. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume a $u' - y$ geodesic contains x. Then, a $w' - x$ geodesic, hence also a $w - x$ geodesic, contains y. It follows that $w \in S \cap V(G_1)$ strongly resolves x and y. □

(b) This follows from the fact $sdim(P) = 1$ and the additivity of *sdim* over disjoint components.

(c) Since ℓ is a peripheral leaf in G, there exists a vertex $u \in V(G)$ such that $\ell u \in E(G)$ with $\deg_G(u) = 2$. Let $G' = G - \ell$. Since $\mathcal{M}_G(u) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{M}_{G'}(u) = \mathcal{M}_G(\ell)$, $sdim(G-\ell) = sdim(G)$. □

Remark 3.9. *Let G be a unicyclic graph, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the unique cycle of G.*

(a) For an appropriate vertex $v \in V(G)$, $sdim(G) - sdim(G-v)$ can be arbitrarily large. If G is a unicyclic graph as in (a) of Figure 3, then $sdim(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + k - 1$ and $sdim(G-v) = k+1$.

(b) There exists G such that, for an appropriate vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{C})$, $sdim(G-v) = sdim(G) + 2$. If G is a unicyclic graph as in (b) of Figure 3, then $sdim(G) = 6$ (the solid vertices form a minimum strong resolving set of G) and $sdim(G-v) = 8$.



Figure 3: Unicyclic graph G and an appropriate vertex $v \in V(G)$

Lemma 3.10. *Let H be a **generalized** partial n-sun. Then $Z(H) \leq sdim(H)$.*

Proof. It's clear that our claim holds for a H which has only one major vertex. Thus, we may assume that H contains at least two major vertices. Let H^0 be a maximal partial n-sun contained in H; then $Z(H^0) \leq sdim(H^0)$ by Cororllary 3.6. For $i \geq 0$, let H^{i+1} denote the graph obtained as the vertex sum of a P_2 with H^i at a major vertex of H^i, so that $H = H^k$ for some $k \geq 0$. By the choice of H^0, we have $sdim(H^{i+1}) = sdim(H^i) + 1 \geq Z(H^i) + 1 \geq Z(H^{i+1})$ for each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, where the left inequality is given by the induction hypothesis. □

Now, we arrive at our main result.

Theorem 3.11. *If G is a unicyclic graph, then $Z(G) \leq sdim(G)$.*

Proof. Assume $Z(G) > sdim(G)$ for some unicyclic graph G. By trimming as much as possible, but NOT trimming at any vertex lying on the unique cycle $\mathcal{C}$ of G, we arrive at a generalized partial n-sun $H \subseteq G$. We descend from the given G to H by, for each trim at an allowed vertex x of G', discarding all components of $G' - x$ except the connected component G'' containing $\mathcal{C}$. Let $G' - x = G'' + T_1 + \ldots + T_m$, where $+$ denotes disjoint union. Remark 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 imply $Z(G'' + T_1 + \ldots + T_m) > sdim(G'' + T_1 + \ldots + T_m)$ which, by the additivity of both Z and $sdim$, is equivalent to

$$Z(G'') + \sum_{i=1}^{m} Z(T_i) > sdim(G'') + \sum_{i=1}^{m} sdim(T_i). \tag{1}$$

Since $Z(T_i) \leq sdim(T_i)$ for each tree T_i by Theorem 2.4, inequality (1) implies $Z(G'') > sdim(G'')$. Through this process of "descent", we eventually reach $Z(H) > sdim(H)$, which is the desired contradiction to Lemma 3.10. □

Remark 3.12. *There exists a unicyclic graph G satisfying $Z(G) = sdim(G)$. For an odd integer $k \geq 3$, let G be a partial $2k$-sun with the unique cycle $\mathcal{C}$ given by $u'_1 u_2 u'_3 u_4 \ldots u'_{2k-1} u_{2k}$ such that $ter(u_{2j}) = 0$ and $ter(u'_{2j-1}) = 1$, where $1 \leq j \leq k$ (see Figure 4). Then $Z(G) = k$ by Theorem 3.5, and $sdim(G) = k$: (i) $sdim(G) \geq k$ since u_j MMD u_{j+k} for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots k\}$; (ii) $sdim(G) \leq k$ since $\{u_{2j-1} \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ forms a strong resolving set for G.*



Figure 4: Unicyclic graphs G with $Z(G) = sdim(G)$

4 A concluding thought

The cycle rank $r(G)$ of a connected graph G is defined as $|E(G)| - |V(G)| + 1$. In the preceding sections, we have provided *sharp* bounds (relating $Z(G)$ and $sdim(G)$) when $r(G)$ equals 0 or 1; now, we offer a rough bound which, notably, places no restriction on $r(G)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let G be a connected graph with cycle rank $r(G)$. Then $Z(G) \leq sdim(G)+3\cdot r(G)$.*

Proof. Let T be a spanning tree of G obtained through the deletion of $r = r(G)$ edges of G. We have $Z(G) \leq Z(T) + r \leq sdim(T) + r$, where the left and right inequalities are respectively given by Theorem 3.2(a) and Theorem 2.4. Since the removal of an edge e from G results in at most two more leaves in $G - e$, we have $\sigma(T) \leq 2r + \sigma(G)$. Since $sdim(T) = \sigma(T) - 1$ by Theorem 2.1(b), we have $Z(G) \leq 2r + \sigma(G) - 1 + r$. Since $\sigma(G) - 1 \leq sdim(G)$ by Observation 3.1, we obtain $Z(G) \leq sdim(G) + 3r$. □

Question. What is the best k such that $Z(G) \leq sdim(G) + k \cdot r(G)$ for any connected graph G?

We conjecture $0 < k < 1$, as suggested by the following example.

Example . Let $G = P_s \square P_s$ be the Cartesian product of P_s with itself, where $s \geq 2$. Then $Z(G) = s$ (see [1]) and $sdim(G) = 2$. Notice that $r(G) = (s-1)^2$. So, $Z(G) = sdim(G) + \frac{s-2}{(s-1)^2} r(G)$. See Figure 5 when $s = 3$, where the solid vertices in Figure 5(a) form a minimum zero forcing set for G and the solid vertices in Figure 5(b) form a minimum strong resolving set for G.

Figure 5: $Z(P_3 \square P_3) = 3$ and $sdim(P_3 \square P_3) = 2$

References

[1] F. Barioli, W. Barrett, S. Butler, S.M. Cioabă, D. Cvetković, S.M. Fallat, C. Godsil, W. Haemers, L. Hogben, R. Mikkelson, S. Narayan, O. Pryporova, I. Sciriha, W. So, D. Stevanović, H. van der Holst, K. Vander Meulen and A.W. Wehe (AIM Minimum Rank-Special Graphs

Work Group), Zero forcing sets and the minimum rank of graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **428** (2008) 1628-1648.

[2] F. Barioli, S. Fallat and L. Hogben, On the difference between the maximum multiplicity and path cover number for tree-like graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **409** (2005) 13-31.

[3] D. Burgarth and V. Giovannetti, Full control by locally induced relaxation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 100501.

[4] D. Burgarth and K. Maruyama, Indirect Hamiltonian identification through a small gateway. *New J. Phys.* **11** (2009) 103019.

[5] G. Chartrand, L. Eroh, M.A. Johnson and O.R. Oellermann, Resolvability in graphs and the metric dimension of a graph. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **105** (2000) 99-113.

[6] K. Chilakamarri, N. Dean, C.X. Kang and E. Yi, Iteration index of a zero forcing set in a graph. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **64** (2012) 57-72.

[7] C.J. Edholm, L. Hogben, M. Huynh, J. LaGrange and D.D. Row, Vertex and edge spread of zero forcing number, maximum nullity, and minimum rank of a graph. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **436** (2012) 4352-4372.

[8] L. Eroh, C.X. Kang and E. Yi, A comparison between the metric dimension and zero forcing number of trees and unicyclic graphs. *arXiv:1408.5943*.

[9] L. Eroh, C.X. Kang and E. Yi, Metric dimension and zero forcing number of two families of line graphs. *Math. Bohem.*, to appear.

[10] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson, *Computers and intractability: A guide to the theory of NP-completeness.* Freeman, New York (1979).

[11] F. Harary and R.A. Melter, On the metric dimension of a graph. *Ars Combin.* **2** (1976) 191-195.

[12] L. Hogben, M. Huynh, N. Kingsley, S. Meyer, S. Walker and M. Young, Propagation time for zero forcing on a graph. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **160** (2012) 1994-2005.

[13] C.X. Kang and E. Yi, Probabilistic zero forcing in graphs. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **67** (2013) 9-16.

[14] C.X. Kang and E. Yi, The fractional strong metric dimension of graphs. COCOA'13, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* **8287** (2013) 84-95.

[15] S. Khuller, B. Raghavachari and A. Rosenfeld, Landmarks in graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **70** (1996) 217-229.

[16] O.R. Oellermann and J. Peters-Fransen, The strong metric dimension of graphs and digraphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **155** (2007) 356-364.

[17] D.D. Row, A technique for computing the zero forcing number of a graph with a cut-vertex. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **436** (2012) 4423-4432.

[18] A. Sebö and E. Tannier, On metric generators of graphs. *Math. Oper. Res.* **29** (2004) 383-393.

[19] S. Severini, Nondiscriminatory propagation on trees. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** (2008) 482002.

[20] P.J. Slater, Leaves of trees. *Congr. Numer.* **14** (1975) 549-559.

[21] E. Yi, On strong metric dimension of graphs and their complements. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* **29** (2013) 1479-1492.